DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 814 HE 034 487

AUTHOR Hart, Jennifer L.
TITLE Women and Feminism in Higher Education Scholarship: An Analysis of Three Core Journals.
PUB DATE 2001-11-00
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (26th, Richmond, VA, November 15-18, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; *Females; *Feminism; *Gender Issues; *Higher Education; Scholarly Journals; *Scholarship

ABSTRACT

This study examined the response of higher education to the increased presence of women in the academy through an investigation of academic literature. A feminist framework was used to guide the analysis, which focused on 5 years of three leading journals in higher education: (1) "The Review of Higher Education" (RHE); (2) "The Journal of Higher Education" (JHE); and (3) "Research in Higher Education" (ResHE). Research articles were selected that had titles that indicated that the article concerned women or a subject especially associated with women. Data show that some scholars do use a feminist frame to guide their research in spite of the limited use of the word "feminism" in an article title or in the text of the article. Over two-thirds of the articles coded as gendered from their titles were identified as feminist in nature, but when the larger picture was examined, only 8.4% of all the articles appeared grounded in feminist theory. Gender was most salient in JHE, coded in 22.7% of the article abstracts, and least salient in RHE, coded in 15% of the abstracts. Thirty-five percent of the title-gendered articles were not identified as feminist in ResHE; gender only served as a research variable in those articles. Women and feminism were explicitly included in only 84 articles of those selected, and a comparison with a previous study by B. Townsend (1993) indicates that over time, the number of times women and feminism have been included in articles has remained relatively stable. (Contains 4 tables and 38 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 457 814

J Hart

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Women and Feminism in Higher Education Scholarship: An Analysis of Three Core Journals

Jennifer L. Hart
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Arizona

Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education National Conference, Richmond, VA, November 2001

HE034180

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Today, more women than ever before are active participants in higher education. Given this shifting post-secondary climate, I would expect to see more scholarship by women and about women, as well as an increase in feminist scholarship than in previous generations. Thus, the purpose of my paper is to examine the response of higher education to the increased presence of women in the academy through an investigation of academic literature. By analyzing data collected from three leading journals in higher education, *The Review of Higher Education* (RHE), *The Journal of Higher Education*,(JHE), and *Research in Higher Education* (ResHE), I hope to better understand how feminist scholarship is, and how women are, treated in scholarly work.

Theory and Methodology

To guide my analysis, I will use a feminist framework. I am interested in whether women continue to be marginalized in academe because of their gender. As a result, this perspective will shape how I view the data that emerge, for I see academe as entrenched in the power of patriarchy. In addition, since I will be looking at academic scholarship, which is critical to faculty work, I will use professionalization theory to further frame my study. Professionalization theory suggests that the reward structure and the status of the professorate are tightly coupled with producing research for juried publications. Thus, the nature of faculty work is constructed, in part, by the content of the leading journals (Silverman, 1987). Knowing who and what gets published is important to better understand the value of feminism and how women are treated in one aspect of academic work.

Research by DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, and Robinson (1985) serves as a model for my study. As previously mentioned, I will use three core journals in higher

education (Townsend, 1993) for my analysis. DuBois *et al.* (1985) examined the publication patterns in several disciplines from 1966 through 1980. Their study was intended to capture the nature of scholarly work during the height of second wave feminism. My study, while considerably more narrow in scope, seeks to extend DuBois *et al.*'s (1985) work by looking at the extent to which feminism and women are featured in current higher education scholarship during the third wave of feminism (specifically from 1994-1999). The temporal constraint for this analysis is significant because it provides the most recent perspective on the treatment of feminism and women in this discipline. Scholarly work in higher education is multidisciplinary and includes a broad range of themes (Townsend, 1993). Women and feminism are just two of the many possible topics. However, given the increasing roles of women in higher education coupled with the pursuit of higher education scholars to include a broad diversity of voices, investigating academic work during the third wave of feminism may illustrate how higher education has responded to this changing landscape.

For this five year period, I counted titles that indicated that an article concerned women or a subject especially associated with women (DuBois *et al.*, 1985). The titles were compiled by copying the title pages from RHE and JHE. For ResHE, the back cover was the data source, as it served as the table of contents for that publication. Since book reviews, presidential addresses, and review essays were not features in all the selected journals, I decided not to count those items; only research articles were included in my analysis.

To determine whether a title should be counted, I looked for specific code words. Titles that were considered to address women and/or feminism contained at least one of

the following words: woman, women, girl(s), sister(s), female, lesbian, sexual orientation, gender, sex, sexist, sexism, feminist, and feminism.

After counting gendered titles, I used the same coding strategy to count abstracts. I did so because I assumed that, in some cases, abstracts may address women or feminism despite the fact that the title did not suggest it. It is important to mention that for RHE and JHE, abstracts followed the title of each article on the title pages (except for one issue of RHE) and those abstracts served as data sources. However, my coding process was slightly different for ResHE. Since abstracts did not accompany the article titles as in the other journals, I analyzed the abstracts that appeared in the beginning of each journal article. This method was employed for all articles in ResHE, save one, which did not include an abstract. For that article, and for the articles in the anomalistic issue of RHE, I used the abstract listed in the on-line ERIC database.

I also counted all articles (not only those that were coded as gendered) that were written by women. Author names accompanied the titles of all journal articles under investigation. I used the first name to determine an author's gender. If a name was androgynous, initialed, or unfamiliar, I did not count it as female. Although fewer than ten names fit into this category, the number of women authors counted may err slightly on the low side. With the authors, I disaggregated them by counting single authored papers; co-authored papers by women; and co-authored papers where at least one woman was listed, but men were also contributing to the work. Through this analysis, I hoped to get a sense of whether the gender of the author has factored into publishing patterns.

Finally, since I am particularly interested in feminist scholarship, and not all gendered work is feminist (Townsend, 1993), I read the text of all articles that were

coded as gendered in the title. The research decision to analyze the articles coded for gender in the title rather than in the abstract and/or title was intentional; for, in the end, this made the study more manageable in scope.

I adapted a definition of feminism for this study from Stanley's (1990) and Worell's (1994) work on feminist research. This definition was used to categorize whether a particular article was written from a feminist perspective. To be identified as feminist, the work must challenge gender oppression (the patriarchy) and include implications for social change. This means that the scholarship cannot solely seek to inform and raise awareness of gender oppression, it must also be proactive in suggesting remedies for inequity. For, to be true to the nature of feminism, feminist scholarship must be rooted in activism and social change.

While the methods the scholar use in her or his research can support a feminist agenda, I did not rely on the methodology alone to categorize a particular article. Like Stanley (1990), I strongly believe that no one set of methods should be seen as distinctly feminist. Moreover, "feminists should use any and every means available for investigating the 'condition of women in sexist society'" (Stanley, 1990, p. 12). Thus, it is the integrity of the research in toto that must be considered in order to determine whether it is feminist in nature.

After categorizing an article as feminist, I further analyzed the language of the article and the supporting references to determine the particular strand of feminism that framed the text (liberal, radical, left, or psychoanalytic). While all feminist stands are "founded upon the belief that women suffer from systematic social injustices because of their sex...and...[are] committed to some form of reappraisal of the position of women in

society" (Whelehan, 1995, p. 25), each strand differs in defining the source of oppression. It is important to briefly explore each strand in order to better understand the nuances that led to an article's identification as liberal, radical, left, or psychoanalytic feminism.

Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism, as its name suggests, finds its roots in liberalism. Individual autonomy and the right to self-determination are primary values, and the burden is on the individual to redress inequity (Black, 1989; Calas & Smircich, 1996; Jaggar, 1983; Whelehan, 1995). This dominant strand of feminism adapts the arguments of rational structural/functional theories that have traditionally omitted women to guide attempts to ensure equal treatment in the labor force (Shelton & Agger, 1993). This is to say that liberal feminists believe that women should have equal access to a meritocracy and are reluctant to oppose the economic system that is in place (*i.e.*, capitalism), for when the system is void of discrimination, it appropriately rewards the most productive (Whelehan, 1995).

Liberal feminists are often referred to as equity feminists, as equal treatment in the workplace is the ultimate goal. Unlike some of the other strands of contemporary feminism, liberal feminism is primarily concerned with women's roles outside the home. Domestic labor, including child care, are still considered part of the woman's domain in liberal feminism; however, what occurs in the domestic sphere is not central to the concerns liberal feminists are trying to address (Whelehan, 1995).

Radical Feminism

Radical feminists differ from liberal feminists in that they seek cultural transformation, not just equity (Calas & Smircich, 1996; Whelehan, 1995). In addition,

separatism, not assimilation is a hallmark of this paradigm (Black, 1989) and is what makes "radical" feminism radical. However, radical feminism is difficult to define and trace back to a particular theoretical influence or influences because its epistemology is diverse, created from the voices and experiences of different women (Jaggar, 1983; Whelehan, 1995). Furthermore, it is personal life that is the focus, rather than social structures. It is radical feminists who coined the phrase "the personal is political" that many strands now endorse (Whelehan, 1995).

Radical feminism portrays alternate worlds outside of patriarchy. Through grassroots mobilization, radical feminists create "womanspace," separatist enclaves to raise awareness about the oppression of the patriarchy. This "consciousness raising" is a fundamental strategy for this strand of feminists; for, without understanding, one lives with false consciousness and cannot adequately question the dominant oppressive culture.

Jaggar (1983) states that radical feminists want evolutionary change. Through consciousness raising and developing a women's culture through art, literature, and music, radical feminists seek to undermine, rather than overthrow, the patriarchy (Jaggar, 1983; Whelehan, 1995). In addition, oppression is focused on women as women, not as workers, directing change at institutions like marriage, sexuality, and love. These strategies and goals are rarely considered a part of the fabric of academe. Yet, radical feminism can influence academic activism.

Left Feminism

While maintaining the radical feminist mantra of the personal is political, left feminists describe dual sources of oppression. It is not only the patriarchy that oppresses women; the capitalist labor economy also oppresses (Shelton & Agger, 1993). Scholars

label this strand of feminism as Marxist, social, socialist, or left (Black, 1989; Calas & Smircich, 1996; Jaggar, 1983; Shelton & Agger, 1993; Whelehan, 1995), although some make a slight distinction between Marxist and socialist feminism (Calas & Smircich, 1996; Jaggar, 1983). For example, Marxist feminism, according to Calas and Smircich (1996) and Jaggar (1983), focuses first and foremost on modes of production in the non-domestic economy. Socialist feminists, as described by these scholars, emphasize the domestic and external labor markets and include the influences of culture and politics. However, some scholars do not make such a distinction. Because of the somewhat inconsistent ways this strand of feminism is described, I have chosen to adopt Shelton & Agger's (1993) moniker, left feminism. Left feminism, as I use it, is influenced by Marxism and the oppression of class struggle, but like Calas and Smircich's (1996) and Jaggar's (1983) theory of socialist feminism, it combines a multi-issue politic to explain that oppression is mutually influenced by capitalism the patriarchy, culture, and history. These feminists are critical of liberal feminists, as they lack an understanding of the labor process (Calas & Smircich, 1996). Moreover, unlike radical feminists, left feminists encourage men to become involved in confronting the sources of oppression. Failure to include men will only continue to perpetuate the patriarchy (Whelehan, 1995).

Psychoanalytic Feminism

As the name suggests, psychoanalytic feminism is rooted in psychology—specifically from the work of Freud, but correcting his misogynist biases (Calas & Smircich, 1996). This perspective focuses on the differences in the ways of knowing, understanding, and perceiving the world created by the patriarchy. While proponents of this strand of feminism tend to reject biological determinism, psychoanalytic feminism is

often considered essentialist, as it focuses on the unique female nature (Whelehan, 1995). This is to say that men and women are fundamentally different. Whether criticized as essentialist or not, this strand does not limit women to the sphere of work or of home. Rather, it emphasizes the emotional connections that evolve in all daily social interactions (Calas & Smircich, 1996; Whelehan, 1995).

Research Questions

Given the multifaceted design of my study, the research questions I sought to answer are:

1) How many articles are about, or concern women?

2) Are articles written from a feminist perspective?

3) If so, what strand of feminism is used as a conceptual framework?

4) Are women treated only as a variable?

5) How many articles are written by women?

6) What is not being addressed with regard to women and feminism?

Findings

Tables 1 – 5 contain a summary of my findings.

[Insert Tables 1-4 here.]

The data suggest that there is no consistent pattern over the last five years with regard to the treatment of women. The numbers have fluctuated for all three journals. What is clear is that feminism is rarely (.49%) mentioned in scholarly titles or abstracts from 1994-1999. This finding is particularly interesting given the variety of other theoretical frameworks referenced in titles and abstracts. Included among those theories

are post-positivism, post-modernism (referenced multiple times), professionalization, and post-structuralism.

[Insert Table 5 here.]

The data show that some scholars do use a feminist frame to guide their research, despite the limited use of the word *feminism* in an article title or even in the text of the article. Over two-thirds of the articles coded as gendered from their title were identified as feminist in nature. While 68% may seem considerable, it is important to note that when the larger picture is examined, a paltry 8.4% of the articles are grounded in feminist theory. (*N.B.*, 8.4% may be a slight underestimation, as only the articles coded with gender in the title, rather than all published articles, were under investigation.)

Scholarly work in higher education is multidisciplinary and includes a broad range of themes (Townsend, 1993). Women and feminism are just two of the many possible topics. Therefore, given the broad range of social theories that could guide scholarly work, some may argue that 8.4% of all the articles over a five year period in three journals is respectable. While I would disagree with that argument, what is even more compelling is that 70.1% of the articles identified as feminist employed elements of liberal feminism and 41.2% employed elements of psychoanalytic feminism. Nine articles (26.5%) were influenced by radical feminism and one article (3%) used a left feminist perspective.[1] These numbers suggest that while scholars ground their work in feminism, liberal feminism pervades the vast majority of feminist research in these core journals.

[1] These totals equal more than 100% because fourteen (41.2%) of the articles were framed using multiple strands of feminism.

Discussion

Treatment of Women and Feminism

Gender is most salient in JHE, coded in 22.7% of the abstracts, and least salient in RHE, coded in 15% of the abstracts. It is worth noting that from analyzing the content of the titles and abstracts, gender appeared to be used most often (and only) as a variable in ResHE, limiting the likelihood of a feminist framework for those particular articles. Unlike the other journals where the code words varied considerably between data sources, in ResHE gender was the code word cited in all but four cases. In addition to the prevalence of the code word "gender", the language of the titles suggests that gender is treated as a variable rather than as a study about the experience of women. Moreover, the analysis of the articles supports this assumption. Thirty-five percent of the title-gendered articles were not identified as feminist in ResHE; gender serves only as a research variable in these articles.

This study shows that women and feminism are explicitly included in only 84 articles. A similar study by Townsend (1993) looked at a sample of the titles and subtitles of articles in these same journals from 1969-1989. She found that, even in the height of second wave feminism, there were few articles that focused on women's experiences and concerns (Townsend, 1993). Therefore, it appears that over time, the number of times that women and feminism have been included in articles has remained relatively stable. This shows that the role of feminism and women has neither waxed nor waned. Thus, the marginal status of feminism in higher education scholarship that Townsend (1993) found pre-dating and throughout the 1980s has continued. A backlash

against feminism is not evident, however, a continued backgrounding of feminism and women is.

Articles Framed by Feminism

Higher education is not isolated from the social, political, and cultural climate in the United States. In a social and political climate where affirmative action is being questioned, and in some cases dismantled, and where the ideological pendulum is swinging right, it is not surprising that anti-feminist rhetoric is also central to the common discourse. The conservative 1980s in the United States have marked the beginning of a backlash against women that has remained until today (Faludi, 1991; Glazer-Raymo, 1999). As such, it is not surprising that the recent scholarship reflects the current conservative ideologies (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Kolodny, 1998). This may mean that editors and reviewers are less likely to consider gendered or feminist work or that authors are less willing to submit gendered or feminist work (Townsend, 1993). Supporting and expanding on this, Glazer-Raymo (1999) posits that women in higher education "continue to be reticent about characterizing their research as feminist" (p.31). Therefore, the potential backlash and/or marginalization from academic colleagues may be too large a price to pay for women (and men) to integrate feminist perspectives into their scholarship (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Kolodny, 1998).

Although it is impossible to determine the total number of articles that are framed by feminism using my design, there are two articles of the 407 under investigation that "risk" explicitly mentioning feminism in either the title or abstract (*i.e.*, Dickens & Sagaria, 1997; Heinrich, 1995). While neither article explicitly defines the conceptual framework used as feminist, both are grounded in feminist theory. A total of 34 articles

(including the Dickens and Sagaria (1997) study) identified from gendered titles use a feminist perspective. However, only one article, "Understanding and investigating female friendship's educative value" (Aleman, 1997) explicitly identifies her theoretical framework as feminist.

Perhaps because of the fear of marginality or perhaps for stylistic reasons, authors may not be explicit about their feminist frame. For the same reasons, authors may purposely define their feminist framework or interest in treating gender in the context of an article rather than in the title or abstract. As a result, the following discussion will explore the gender-identified articles in greater depth.

As previously mentioned, the overwhelming majority of articles employ elements of liberal feminism. Many of the articles (*e.g.*, Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Boudreau, *et al*, 1997; Gossweiler & Slevin, 1995; Hagedorn, 1996; Leslie, McClure, & Oaxaca, 1998; Rayman & Brett, 1995; Riger, Stokes, Raja, & Sullivan, 1997; Schwartz, 1997a, 1997b) discussed how women were underrepresented among faculty or administrators, or students in mathematics and science. The essence of these articles demonstrated the inequities and ultimately called for equal representation, values central to liberal feminism. This finding is not surprising, as liberal feminism is the least controversial of the many strands of feminism. The goal of liberal feminism is to work within the existing structure—consistent with the very process of academic scholarship itself—to reach equity. Further, it is likely the most palatable perspective for reviewers and editors, a factor that should not be minimized given the publishing demands of the academic reward system.

Nine articles utilized radical feminism. Three of these articles emphasize the value of separatism through the existence of women's colleges (Kim & Alvarez, 1995; Smith, Wolf, & Morrison, 1995; Wolf-Wendel, 1998). However, only one article was identified as being influenced solely by radical feminism (*i.e.*, Wolf-Wendel, 1998); the remaining articles demonstrated examples of liberal and/or psychoanalytic feminism as well as radical feminism. Yet, it was the radical feminist perspective that led to the use of the strongest language against male-dominated oppression. For example:

> As a lightning rod for women's involvement on campus, the dean of women was no longer a positive force for change but a pariah. The caricature of spinsterly, 'snooping battle axes' gained credence in the 1950s, allowing the final denigration of a proud, respected, and pioneering professional--the dean of women (Schwartz, 1997b, p.434);
>
> and
>
> ...the contemporary research university replicates the patriarchal family wherein fathers are breadwinners, mothers are domestic laborers, and prodigious daughters are encouraged to identify with their fathers and brothers more strongly than mothers or sisters (Park, 1996, p. 77).

While several articles focus on academic wages and labor (*e.g.*, Balzer, *et al.*, 1996; Bellas, 1997; Boudreau, *et al.*, 1997; Callaway, Fuller,& Schoenberger,1996; Dutt, 1997; Jacobs, 1999), only one article was explicit in identifying modes of capital as contributing to women's oppression (*i.e.*, Bellas, 1997). From a left feminist perspective, Bellas (1997) states, "clearly, the time has come for closer scrutiny of academic salary-setting and the mechanisms that introduce bias into this process" (p. 316). She implies that the capitalistic labor market has contributed to the inequity of salaries between women and men. Other articles about the gender gap in pay provide evidence of the gap, but do not identify any reasons for the disparity. These scholars purport that inequity is bad, but they rely on a liberal feminist response. It is assumed that the current market

structure should remedy the situation. Moreover, the preponderance of liberal feminist perspectives in the articles analyzed make little room for left feminism, as left feminism seeks a different system, not just modification of the existing system.

After liberal feminism, the strand that is integrated most often into the academic scholarship under investigation is psychoanalytic feminism. Fourteen articles wove the vital elements of self-esteem and connection into women's success. Many referred to well-known psychoanalytic feminists like Belenky, Chodorow, and Gilligan to support their arguments (*e.g.*, Aleman, 1997; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Drew & Work, 1998; Gossweiler & Slevin, 1995; Heinrich, 1995; Park, 1996; Rayman & Brett, 1995; Seagram, Gould, & Pyke, 1998). This strand of feminism, like liberal feminism, tends to seek solutions by modifying, not by dismantling, the existing system. Furthermore, the language of growth and development, particularly when discussing undergraduate students, is popular in the literature. As such, it is not surprising that psychoanalytic feminism appears to undergird more than one-third of the feminist articles identified in this study.

However, it is important to reiterate that over one-third of the feminist articles used a combination of feminist strands. This suggests that feminism is a complex theoretical perspective. The diversity of theoretical and professional influences contributes to creating the foundation of one's intellectual agenda. Thus, the face of academic feminism, as identified in scholarship, is equally diverse. Amidst this diversity, however, is a powerful thread of liberal feminism. While it may be true that authors included elements of liberal feminism to intentionally "soften the feminist blow," I also believe that many academic feminists truly embrace liberal feminism. So, the presence

of liberal feminist ideology in feminist scholarship is not surprising. Although the assumed safety of academic freedom should make room for feminists representing different strands, the evidence from this study suggests otherwise. This is to say that while employing a theoretical frame that includes more than one strand of feminism increases the complexity and diversity of academic feminism, many strands of feminism, like radical and left, still remain in the margins.

Women as Authors

Despite the lack of titles and abstracts dealing with gender and feminism, scholarship by women *is* included in the core higher education journals. Female authors, whether a single author or co-author, appeared in 58% of the articles in RHE, in 46.7% of the articles in ResHE, and in 42.6% of the articles in JHE. Male authors appeared in 67% of the articles in RHE, 80.8% of the articles in ResHE, and 79.4% of the articles in JHE. While it is encouraging that women are publishing at a reasonable rate in these journals, what is peculiar is that women co-author articles with men more often than serving as a single author or as a co-author with other women. It is possible that since more men are tenured faculty, junior faculty, including women, are writing with senior men in order to initiate a publishing career. It is also possible that this phenomenon, like those previously described, is linked to a concern that women may not be embraced by the academic community and may face a backlash. Judith Worell (1994) supports this fear by stating that many authors, because of their gender and minority status, are less likely to find publication outlets in major scholarly journals. Furthermore, women's work is less cited than that of men, and women are less often listed as first author (Worell, 1994). In addition, the data from this study show that women co-author with other women less than

with men. While choosing to write with other women is often considered a feminist strategy (Dickens & Sagaria, 1997), the very fact that it is a *feminist* strategy may make co-authorship rare. Employing this strategy is risky when the likelihood of publication is perceived in jeopardy when women are co-authors rather than including a male voice.

Missing Voices

Although the findings of this research are limited by the fact that I only coded titles and abstracts, they do demonstrate that women and feminism are not dominant in the higher education discourse. Even less dominant are certain aspects of women's lives. The data examined rarely focus on gender as it relates to race, class, and sexual orientation. In fact, preliminary data collected from this same sample of journals show that 17% of the titles and abstracts mention issues related to race/ethnicity and/or class. Also of little consequence in this survey of titles and abstracts are the large numbers of women in the academy other than faculty or students. Further, the focus of the articles about women primarily center on the lack of achievement and the need to improve persistence. Moreover, the scholarship often describes women as victims of the system. No article focused on the resilience and successes of women. In addition, there are many other issues significant to the lives of women in the academy at any level that remain either un(der)studied or unpublished. Finally, I noted that discussions about feminism as a multi-issue politic or even as some form of balkanized identity politic are also missing from the literature. These voids indicate that further research must be conducted to represent the broad range of women's and feminists' voices in academe.

Conclusion and Call for Research

Women and feminism are not prevalent themes in recent higher education scholarship, a reality that has not changed dramatically since 1969 (Townsend, 1993). I have considered several possible explanations for this phenomenon. My findings indicate that this study can serve as a springboard for other research. For example, similar studies that look at race, class and sexual orientation can better inform the academic community about what scholarship is valued and what scholarship needs to be inserted into the academic discourse. In addition, it would be interesting to expand this study to include conference proceedings for the professional organizations related to these journals. Such a study could seek to answer whether journals mirror conference content and whether woman-related or feminist issues are more welcomed at professional meetings than in journals. Finally, a call for feminist research from a variety of strands can move the academy to a place where issues of gender, including *radical* feminist perspectives, will be perceived as, and will be, welcomed.

References

Aleman, A.M.M. (1997). Understanding and investigating female friendship's educative value. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(2), 119-159.

Balzer, W., Boudreau, N., Hutchinson, P., Ryan, A.M., Thorsteinson, T., Sullivan, J., Yonker, R., & Snavely, D. (1996). Critical modeling principles when testing for gender equity in faculty salary. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(6), 633-658.

Bellas, M.L. (1997). Disciplinary differences in faculty salaries: Does gender bias play a role? *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(3), 299-321.

Bellas, M.L., & Toutkoushian, R.K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race, and family effects. *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(4), 367-390.

Black, N. (1989). *Social feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Boudreau, N., Sullivan, J., Balzer, W., Ryan, A.M., Yonker, R., Thorsteinson, T., & Hutchinson, P. (1997). Should faculty rank be included as predictor variable in studies of gender equity in university faculty salaries? *Research in Higher Education, 38*(3), 297-312.

Bronstein, P., & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(5), 557-586.

Calas, M.B., & Smircich, L. (1996). From 'the woman's' point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W.R. Nord (Eds.) *Handbook of organizational studies* (pp. 218-257). London: Sage.

Callaway, R., Fuller, R., & Schoenberger, R. (1996). Gender differences in employment and starting salaries of business majors during the 1980s: The impact of college-acquired characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(5), 599-614.

Dickens, C.S., & Sagaria, M.A.D. (1997). Feminists at work: Collaborative relationships among women faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(1), 79-101.

Drew, T.L., & Work, G.G. (1998). Gender-based differences in perception of experiences in higher education: Gaining a broader perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(5), 542-555.

DuBois, E.C., Kelly, G.P., Kennedy, E.L., Korsmeyer, C.W., & Robinson, L.S. (1985). *Feminist scholarship: Kindling in the groves of academe*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Dutt, D. (1997). How much gender disparity exists in salary? A profile of graduates of a major public university. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(6), 631-646.

Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gossweiler, R.S., & Slevin, K.F. (1995). The importance of gender in the assessment of historical knowledge. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(2), 155-176.

Hagedorn, L.S. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(5), 569-598.

Heinrich, K.T. (1995). Doctoral advisement relationships between women: On friendship and betrayal. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(4), 447-469.

Jacobs, J.A. (1999). Gender and the stratification of colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(2), 161-187.

Jaggar, A.M. (1983). *Feminist politics and human nature*. Sussex: Harvester Press.

Kim, M., & Alvarez, R. (1995). Women-only colleges: Some unanticipated consequences. *The Journal of Higher Education, 66*(6), 641-668.

Kolodny, A. *Failing the future: A dean looks at higher education in the twenty-first century*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Leslie, L.L., McClure, G.T., & Oaxaca, R.L. (1998). Women and minorities in science and engineering: A life sequence analysis. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(3), 238-276.

Park, S.M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(1), 46-84.

Rayman, P., & Brett, B. (1995). Women science majors: What makes a difference in persistence after graduation? *The Journal of Higher Education, 66*(4), 388-414.

Riger, S., Stokes, J., Raja, S., & Sullivan, M. (1997). Measuring perceptions of the work environment for female faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(1), 63-78.

Sax, L.J. (1996). The dynamics of "tokenism": How college students are affected by the proportion of women in their major. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(4), 389-426.

Schwartz, R.A. (1997a). Reconceptualizing the leadership roles of women in higher education: A brief history on the importance of deans of women. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(5), 502-522.

Schwartz, R.A. (1997b). How deans of women became men. *The Review of Higher Education, 20*(4), 419-436.

Seagram, B.C., Gould, J., & Pyke, S.W. (1998). An investigation of gender and other variables on time to completion of doctoral degrees. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 319-336.

Shelton, B.A., & Agger, B. (1993). Shotgun wedding, unhappy marriage, no-fault divorce? Rethinking the feminism-Marxism relationship. In P. England (Ed.) *Theory on gender: Feminism on theory* (pp. 25-42). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Silverman, R.J. (1987). How we know what we know: A study of higher education journal articles. *The Review of Higher Education, 11*(1), 39-59.

Smith, D.G., Wolf, L.E., & Morrison, D.E. (1995). Paths to success: Factors related to the impact of women's colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education, 66*(3), 245-266.

Stanley, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminist praxis: Research, theory, and epistemology in feminist sociology*. New York: Routledge.

Townsend, B.K. (1993). Feminist scholarship in core higher education journals. *The Review of Higher Education, 17*(1), 21-41.

Whelehan, I. (1995). *Modern feminist thought: From the second wave to 'post-feminism'*. New York: New York University Press.

Wolf-Wendel, L.E. (1998). Models of excellence: The baccalaureate origins of successful European American women, African American women, and Latinas. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(2), 141-186.

Worell, J. (1994). Feminist journals: Academic empowerment or professional liability. In S.M. Deats & L.T. Lenker (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy and politics* (pp. 207-216). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Table 1
The Review of Higher Education
Fall 1994-Summer 1999

	Fall 94-Summer 95		Fall 95-Summer 96		Fall 96-Summer 97		Fall 97-Summer 98		Fall 98-Summer 99		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Articles	20		19		18		21		21		99	
Gender in title	1	5	2	10.5	3	16.7	4	19	1	4.8	11	11
Gender in abstract	3	15	1	5.1	2	11	7	33.3	2	9.5	15	15
Feminism	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.8	0	0	1	1
Single Female Author	8	40	4	21.1	4	22	2	9.5	1	4.8	21	21
Co-Authors (all female)	4	20	2	10.5	1	5.6	2	9.5	3	14.3	12	12
Co-Authors (female & male)	1	5	6	31.6	3	16.7	6	28.65	9	42.9	25	25

Table 2
The Journal of Higher Education
November 1994-September 1999

	Fall 94-Summer 95		Fall 95-Summer 96		Fall 96-Summer 97		Fall 97-Summer 98		Fall 98-Summer 99		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Articles	25		27		26		26		37		141	
Gender in title	7	28	4	14.8	4	15.4	5	19.2	2	5.4	22	15.6
Gender in abstract	10	40	4	14.8	5	19.2	9	34.6	4	10.8	32	22.7
Feminism	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
Single Female Author	6	24	4	14.8	5	19.2	3	11.5	4	10.8	22	15.6
Co-Authors (all female)	3	12	1	3.7	0	0	3	11.5	0	0	7	5
Co-Authors (female & male)	8	32	8	29.6	3	11.5	5	19.2	7	18.9	31	22

Table 3
Research in Higher Education
December 1994-October 1999

	Fall 94-Summer 95		Fall 95-Summer 96		Fall 96-Summer 97		Fall 97-Summer 98		Fall 98-Summer 99		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Articles	34		30		35		33		35		167	
Gender in title	1	2.9	5	16.7	2	5.7	4	12.1	5	14.3	17	10.2
Gender in abstract	3	8.8	7	23.3	8	22.9	10	30.3	9	25.7	37	22.2
Feminism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Single Female Author	5	16.7	4	13.3	3	8.6	2	6.1	5	14.3	19	11.4
Co-Authors (all female)	1	2.9	1	3.3	6	17.1	3	9.1	2	5.7	13	7.8
Co-Authors (female & male)	8	23.5	10	33.3	9	25.7	12	36.4	7	20	46	27.5

Table 4
Totals for 3 Core Publications in Higher Education
1994-1999

	#	%
Article Totals	407	
Gender in title	50	12.3%
Gender in abstract	84	20.6%
Feminism Explicit	2	.49%
Single Female Author	62	15.2%
Co-Authors (all female)	32	7.9%
Co-Authors (female & male)	102	25.1%

Table 5
Treatment of Feminism for 3 Core Publications in Higher Education 1994-1999

	# of articles with gender in the title	#(%) of articles using a feminist framework	% of total articles for each journal from 1994-1999
The Review of Higher Education	11	8 (72.7%)	8.1%
The Journal of Higher Education	22	15 (68.2%)	10.6%
Research in Higher Education	17	11 (64.7%)	6.6%
Totals	50	34 (68%)	8.4%